

**Maine Learning Results Review Advisory Committee**  
**April 21, 2005**  
**103 Cross Building, Augusta, ME**

In attendance at meeting: Karoldene Barnes, Anita Bernhardt, Dean Collins, Brian Dancause, John Dorrer, Francis Eberle, Bonnie Fortini, Jon Geiger, Deborah Howard, Dan Hupp, Janice LaChance, Tom Major, Ellie Multer, Becky Berger, MaryJo O'Connor, Patrick Phillips, Valerie Seaberg, John Wright, Brian Dorr, Nini McManamy (guest)

Called to order at 9:10

**Patrick gave brief update.** State policy is simplify, slow down, and support. Expect press coverage next week.

Feds are forming a work group to come to closure around looking at AYP through longitudinal studies. Mary Jo spoke in support and appreciation of the work Patrick Phillips and Susan Gendron are doing. ELL issues are also being included and looked at nationally and in the state. The objective is to make assessment true and indicative of student progress. Performance standards across grades, across subgroups, integration and continuity will be needed to make the system seamless. Annual NCLB testing, at least in 3-8, is pretty well entrenched.

**Ideas from last meeting were reviewed.**

Anita: Handed out two chapters from Michael Fullan's book the New Meaning of Educational Change (Chapters 6 and 13) and Anita described the work that has been done since the last meeting and the work that is pending.

- Patrick and Anita spoke again with Seymour Papert (MIT) and Cary Snider about the role of technology in our standards document. Cary encouraged the MDoE to consider identifying engineering standards instead of technology standards.
- Anita reported on her attendance at the Social studies conference and regarding the Wabanki studies legislation. It is important for us to include this in the review process. As well, we must incorporate the findings of the Citizenship Education Subcommittee of the Learning Results Task Force. The Task Force is eager to ensure that their findings are a part of the MLR Review. There were questions about this. Patrick is a member of the Task Force. He suggested that we need to be clear about where the work of that group and this group meet. Patrick has encouraged the Task Force to keep their focus general. Patrick suggested that Task Force participate on content panels and in focus groups. Ellie voiced her hope that we end up with a balance between people who understand how things work but aren't familiar with the Bill of Rights. Knowledge, skills, participation all need to be part of the picture. Tom asked where the Task Force group came from. Glenn Cummings sponsored legislation that developed the task force to

- address citizenship education. Other groups and efforts exist that are raising parallel conversations. The State is asking such groups to not be prescriptive but seek connections with the Learning Results Review process. Mary Jo said she is pleased that the department is actively being holistic in its approach.
- Anita delivered a power point presentation to the Southern Maine Partnership focused on the Guiding Values for the Review. The group found the presentation informative and suggested creating a CD and that could be available online for districts and the public to use. She delivered a similar presentation to the meeting of the Adult Education Directors. The latter group raised cautions that “post-secondary pursuits” means is perceived as meaning only a 4 year college experience to some and this is a problem.
  - Anita spoke with Mark Tucker about the national experts (Phil Daro/math, James Rutherford /science are reviewing materials from the MDoE) Sally Hampton/literacy and ELA has also been referred to Anita. Still waiting to hear from Diane Ravitch. Anita is looking for national figure in Health/PE. Mark Tucker suggested the military might be a source of expertise. Patrick suggested USDOE and CDC.
  - Anita attended the Improving School Symposium. A discussion about where the leverage points for change exist followed her summary. State Board of Education’s overview of the big picture is also considering leverage points for change. They are aware of the review work. How do you change schools? The Improving Schools Symposium data suggests that clear state standards and solid alignment to those standards are critical, likewise a shared vision, collegiality, and collaborative inquiry are other very important characteristics. The improving schools group is a set of schools that have shown marked improvement in MEA scores. Mary Jo wondered about the absence of “leadership” on the list of significant features. Patrick thought this was included in collegiality.
  - Goals for the Review should be posted next week.
  - The selection of Content area panelists will begin next week. (We’ll work today to define who will be on these panels.)
  - Resources on the web will be updated.
  - Val is helping Anita to coordinate monthly meetings with SARS Team.
  - Instructional Context group will meet with Anita tomorrow.
  - Still to be completed
    - Solidify contracts with national experts.
    - Plan the July 22 and August 11 and 10 Dates for convening the panels
    - Collect CV of the national experts for the Maine Learning Results Review Committee to review before contracts are finalized.

## **Break**

### **Gaining clarity about the work of the national experts versus the work of the content panels.**

- What is a curriculum document vs. an assessment document vs. what features do we want our document to have?
- Keep in mind at this point we think we want our national experts to:
  1. Identify 3 best standards documents in the world for a content area and tell us why.
  2. Look at our MLR and propose a new draft of standards and performance Indicators that is lean and coherent
  3. Provide feedback to our panels during the process
- Conversation that followed.
  1. We need to be explicit about what will be assessed.
  2. We need to tie outcomes to skills, they don't always connect. Large scale assessment isn't always advisable the best way to assess a particular piece of knowledge or a skill.
  3. Something may not assessable by one means, but is accessible through another (large scale paper pencil assessment vs. local assessment. Sometimes we need to assess students' skills in natural settings, but we use standardized setting.
  4. It was suggested that we look at the difference between what it looks like to assess a knowledgeable person in 2005 vs. 1985. Our ideas about assessment are also evolving.
  5. Deborah mentioned that Connecticut documents have both a framework and assessment framework that are connected. They also have integrated assessments.
  6. Brian says we need to have both types, integrated assessment and assessments that get at the widgets of knowledge.
  7. John G. says standards need to test the skills that allow kids to succeed in life (the Guiding Principles).

Anita suggested that we ask the national experts to:

1. What is essential?
2. What are the concepts?
3. Don't worry about being able to measure it on large scale assessment?

Then give this information to the content area panels and ask them to:

1. Find what's missing
2. Determine the level of cognitive demand each performance indicator will be assessed.

Conversation that followed.

1. Coherence in the document is the focus of the national experts, and standards will be spiraled or threaded

2. This is a prime time to switch to a 3-5 grade span, to take advantage of the learning continuum, rather than tied to MEA test years.
3. Threaded standards will help with differentiated instruction.
4. Francis spoke in favor of Anita's proposed plan and suggested that the content panels might have access to an assessment format provided by TAC and PAC (the assessment advisory group) to help guide their thought.
5. Anita recapped that the Content Panels will be provided with some advance work informed by education, business, futurists, etc. and will be asked in their opinion, anything has been left out? What and why? What would you take out to replace it with something else?
6. Brian cautioned that we work with what is observable. For example our guiding principles are observable behaviors but may not be measurable.
7. John W. asked if we think that issues unique to Maine will be brought to the table by the national experts, for example the Wabanaki legislation. It was noted that if the standards are kept lean that local districts will have room for flexibility and choice.
8. Val suggested that we might wish to think generally about local cultural and ethnic communities.
9. Ellie felt it might be useful to insert a piece in the document about what the teacher is expected to bring to the process to make it work.
10. Val also suggested the content panel be charged with a determination of whether or not the essentials and concepts are such that we can derive grade level expectations from them, especially for ELA and Mathematics.
11. John W. asked where the document will address the innate ability of a child to learn. How to assess all kids fairly. Brian said the spiral curriculum will help with that, and gave an example. Anita said we'll have to differentiate between a fundamental skills and knowledge set and differentiated instruction. It is part of the plan to put examples of student work, curriculum and instruction in the document. Jo brought the conversation back full circle to Patrick's comments about the culture of the schools that made improvement on the MEAs. They communicated among each other. Grade level teachers need to be more aware and comfortable with how their subject looks at all different grade levels.
12. Becky Berger suggested a companion document for the standards document so that instructional examples are available.

13. The group agreed that the proposal explaining the division of labor between experts and panels seemed appropriate.
14. John G. asked that we be sure to have the content panels be sure the expert's input connects well and completely to the Guiding Principles. Anita assured us that that is part of the picture
15. Therefore this review of the MLR should guide what is taught, that essential, and provide guidance instruction as well as some instructional contexts. It should be teachable within time available, connect to Guiding Principles, and it is NOT a curriculum guide. The final product should provide clarity about what is assessed and at what level. The LEAs should be able to make decisions about spiraling curriculum up and down by using this document and it should be specific enough to guide LAS and MEA questions for diverse measurements. It should also contain information on using data to improve schools.

## **Lunch**

### **Schedule of upcoming meetings.**

May 5  
June 9 Retreat 23,24  
July 6  
August 17  
September 15  
October 20

### **Who should be on the Content Area Panels?**

Pre K (At ELA, Mathematics and Health PE)  
K-2  
3-5  
6-8  
9-12 (diploma)  
And others on the list for a total of about a dozen.

Conversation that followed.

1. All teachers on panel should not have been involved in the first MLR creation.
2. Curriculum Coordinator in this panel is there to provide non-content area perspective; the DoE specialist will provide the content information balance.
3. John G. suggested for increased integration to include a person from another discipline who uses the content subject (a physicist on the math

- panel, an historian on the science panel. . . This was agreed upon by the group. It was suggested that the C&TE slot might answer John's issue.
4. It was suggested and agreed that we show the template of the panel composition, but not tie position to a specific individuals.
  5. Deborah suggested giving the Curriculum Coordinators pre-training. Francis suggested we use outside practitioners as consultants, going to them to get input. And he also supports the pre-training for the co-chairs. Brian suggested that as part of the training we prepare the panel members to take the big picture view. Have the members serve in terms of representing their "slot" in an overt way. Balance of professional and personal views plays into the panels just as it plays a part in the LRRAC. We need to set this as a basic working premise in all the groups.
  6. Anita discussed the importance of providing a clear pathway of knowledge and skills in numeracy and literacy that will allow for successful transitions for students as they enter and exit the public school system. We are guaranteeing the essential literacy and numeracy knowledge and skill needed by the students to successfully enter into his/her post-secondary world (whether that is work, community college or university).
  7. It was suggested and agreed that there would need to be one or two wild card slot for the disciplines, and 12 to 14 total is a good number. Mary Jo suggested and it was agreed that Pre-K may not be needed in all content areas. Would we access the pre-K people from the Early Childhood standards group? Becky Berger wondered if the Early Childhood Guidelines will be included in the discussion. Anita will check on this. Anita will rework and post the panel composition document on the web. Anita will work on ironing out what it means to be a representative of a given group (are you able to contact others, etc.?)
  8. The group was cautioned to be clear when about information about the review. We want to be careful not build misconceptions as we go.

### **Building an understanding of the issues related to technology.**

Technology Literacy- Technically Speaking, Benchmarks for Technological Literacy

We'll read the chapter using a Jigsaw. As you read your section think about "How does this impact our review and how/what should be have people do with this information?"

The group broke into three reading and discussion groups with the understanding that our job today was to understand the complexity of the conversation, not to reach a solution.

#### **Brainstormed List of Implications for the review**

1. Examine and broaden the definition of technology.
2. Don't tie technology to the discipline of science alone.
3. Huge teacher learning curve goes along with this and will require significant professional development.
4. Technology is a content reservoir, and discipline of knowledge unto itself.
5. Technology has the potential to be integrated across disciplines.
6. Technology is a required prerequisite to all other disciplines.

7. Meets the criteria of universalism because we all use technology sometimes without using science
8. It is a process and a body of knowledge. Engineering is the design process of technology. (John G. said the engineering design is the process of technology.)
9. There is an essential core for technology as there is for any content area.
10. Boys are more interested in technology than girls.
11. It is a systems model of inquiry (input –process-outcome)
12. Students lack the opportunity to think about technology in society in a critical manner—we need to focus on critical thinking skills to get behind the issues.
13. Technology bumps into citizenship education.
14. Technology innovation is really in response to our needs as individuals and a society. We drive it, not the reverse.
15. Technology is becoming increasingly complex and removed from human control.
16. Distinction between educational technology and technology education (the latter is the biggest area of the professional knowledge gap. People think they understand technology education because they understand educational technology.
17. The application of knowledge and the knowledge of application is a definition of technology education (ITEA)
18. Need to understand technology to be able to function in democracy

To close the conversation for the day: If you had a magic wand to make one decision about technology and the review, what would it be?

1. Apprenticeship programs would be part of the school day for all children.
2. Embed an engineering project-based component in the Learning Results.
3. Technology is problem-solving not equipment.
4. Tie technology to ethics in content areas.
5. Each content panel should identify the dimensions of technology education with their content.
6. Define technology more clearly and accurately than it currently is.
7. Is computer science another domain?
8. Have a protocol (designed by John W) for cross-curricular applications of technology and career preparation.
9. High school students would have a technology class because computer literacy is not technology literacy.
10. It is time for us to separate science and technology into two areas one called science and the other called technology.
11. Second to the last idea.
12. Learning Results drive a lot of other things (EPS, PD, and certification), so change the Praxis II exams so there is lots of technology in them.
13. Have practical, funded, staff development with consumers of technology across the state, especially business people.
14. Develop an essential core of knowledge, and skills, for technology.

**Volunteer scribe for next meeting: Brian from PAC**

**Brainstormed Pressure Points to this work:**

- i. Essential vs. manageable
- ii. Balancing the various advocacies that come to the table
- iii. Coordinate all the focus groups for a common voice that doesn't dilute the process
- iv. Issues for professional development and teacher preparation as we approach the new paradigm
- v. Need to ensure teachers and educators are not the only driving force in the process. Voices from other areas need to make the cause for change and the abandonment of business as usual
- vi. The fact that change is going to cause dissonance and this will have an effect because of all the other changes currently being required
- vii. School leadership and staff buy-in
- viii. Tension between "high standards" and "all students" and a common understanding of these terms
- ix. The effect that change will have on those in the field who have done a lot of work in the past. We'll get push-back and spasms of worry
- x. How do we as a committee balance the external resistance vs. our desire to have a better product
- xi. What this will do to the LAS

**Homework: give some thought to the technology when the minutes come out.**

**The meeting was adjourned until 05/05/05 at 3:02.**